

10/534,120

REMARKS:

Claims 1, and 3-12 are pending and stand rejected.

Claim 12 is withdrawn in compliance with an Election/Restriction requirement.

Election/Restriction

Applicant confirms a restriction of the claims to Group I : Claims 1-11. Non-elected Claim 12, has been withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Langstein et al. (US 2002/0086959 = US 6,846,885). The Langstein reference fails to teach each every element of Applicant's claim, thus fails to provide a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Specifically, The Langstein reference fails to teach a cationic catalyst system having Applicant's initiator (I). Applicant's require an initiator (I) that is used as part of a Friedel-Crafts system. The initiator, system as claimed by Applicant requires three elements: an Initiator (I), a catalyst, K, and a cocatalyst (CoK). For instance, in Applicant's examples the (I) is isobutyryl chloride or tert-butyl chloride; the (K) is AlBr₃ or AlCl₃; and the (CoK) is o-Chloranil. The Initiator system described by the Langstein reference contains only two components: zirconium and/or hafnium halide, and a nitroorganic compound. There is no teaching of the (I) initiator component of Applicant's Invention, nor any component in the Langstein examples that would fit Applicant's definition of an initiator (I).

The cationic catalyst system of Langstein is similar to Applicant's Comparative Examples, and to art described in the Background section of the present Application. The Langstein reference describes polymerization reactions having a conversion rate of at best 42% (Example 2) and 50% (Example 6, Comparative). Applicant's cationic catalysis system produces very good yields of >65% (page 4, line 6). The reason for the difference in yield is explained beginning on page 3, line 15 of Applicant's specification.

10/534.120

Since the Langstein reference fails to teach each every element of Applicant's claim, it therefore fails to provide a *prima facie* case of anticipation.

In view of the above, the Applicant believes that the reasons for rejection have been overcome, and the claims herein should be allowable to the Applicant. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted;



Thomas F. Roland, Esq.
Attorney for the Applicants
Reg. No. 42,110

Date: 5/26/06

Customer Number 31684